



Meeting Summary

Lower San Joaquin Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Time: June 29th, 2010, 1:00pm-4:30pm
Location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau
3290 N Ad Art Rd
Stockton, CA 95215

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Name	Organization
<i>Arrich, Jeremy</i>	DWR
<i>Bartlett, Joe</i>	DWR
<i>Churchwell, Roger</i>	SJAFCA
<i>Dell'Osso, Susan</i>	Reclamation District 2062, River Islands
<i>Edwards, Doug</i>	USACE
<i>Encinas, Maria</i>	City of Patterson/ Stanislaus County
<i>Gau, Tom</i>	San Joaquin County
<i>Giottonini, Jim</i>	SJAFCA
<i>Green, John</i>	Stockton East Water District
<i>Hobbs, Jennifer</i>	USFWS
<i>Hollister, Nekane</i>	DWR
<i>Kie, Marti</i>	DWR
<i>Lerner, Noel</i>	DWR
<i>Lott, Carolyn</i>	Center for Collaborative Policy
<i>Magill, Sam</i>	Center for Collaborative Policy
<i>Matsumoto, Sandi</i>	The Nature Conservancy
<i>McIlroy, Sarah</i>	Stantec Consulting
<i>Plantaric, Cait</i>	DWR
<i>Putty, Roger</i>	MWH
<i>Rice, Merritt</i>	DWR
<i>Roseman, Jesse</i>	Tuolumne River Trust
<i>Shelton, John</i>	CDFG
<i>Woodland, Scott</i>	DWR

Absent:

<i>Hildebrand, Mary</i>	San Joaquin farm Bureau, South Delta Water Agency, CVFCA
<i>Kauffman, Kevin</i>	Stockton East Water District
<i>Matella, Mary</i>	American Rivers
<i>Peterson, Dave</i>	SJAFCA

<i>Rentner, Julie</i>	River Partners
-----------------------	----------------

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK

1. Staff will determine the most appropriate place to include a description of how the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) will affect local efforts like the Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study (Feasibility Study).
2. DWR will release/post all materials for the Management Actions Workshops to the CVFMP website (address below) on July 6th. Work Group members will review materials applicable to the workshops they attend and arrive ready to discuss any comments as needed.
3. Staff will develop a system to respond to comments made during meetings. This system, in addition to meeting summaries, will be designed to show participants whether their comments will be included in the CVFPP or require additional consideration.

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Lower San Joaquin Regional Management Action Work Group (Work Group) convened for its first meeting to discuss the Phase 2 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) process and management action structure.

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the Management Actions Report (Report), a key component for developing the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). The Report will identify specific management actions for use in preparing the CVFPP. In subsequent phases of the CVFPP, these management actions will be combined to form regional and system-wide solution sets to problems surrounding the State Plan of Flood Control and adjacent areas. The Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

1. Launch CVFPP Phase 2 and Affirm Regional Management Actions Work Group (RMAWG) Charter
2. Discuss the Relationship of Phase 2 to next Phases of the CVFPP
3. Receive Feedback on the Management Actions Categories and Evaluation Form
4. Organize for Phase 2 Workshops and future Phase 2 work

SUMMARY:

****ALL PRESENTATIONS AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT
www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp****

Welcome

Carolyn Lott opened the meeting, and welcomed participants to the first Work Group meeting of Phase 2. Noel Lerner, DWR Flood Prevention Office (FPO) chief, then introduced himself and his role as Work Group executive sponsor. Finally, Jeremy Arrich, Central Valley Flood Planning Office (CVFPO) chief, introduced himself and thanked participants for attending.

Work Group Charter Review

Ms. Lott asked Work Group members to review the Charter. The Charter lays out the CVFPP purpose, Work Group focus, and how individual management actions will apply to the Lower San Joaquin region. It also describes the ground rules for Work Group engagement, including expected roles and responsibilities such as attendance requirements. Ms. Lott reminded Work Group members that given the tight timeline for Phase 2, if they are unable to attend one of the meetings they should send an alternate in their place.

Discussion:

- A participant asked that the Charter be amended to include a statement on how the CVFPP will be implemented, and how the CVFPP will interact/affect ongoing local efforts such as the Feasibility Study. Because the CVFPP will be a programmatic policy document with high level requirements/recommendations, how it will affect local policies will be very important to local agencies and affected stakeholders. Ms. Lott agreed that this was a very important issue requiring additional thought, but did not think that the Charter was the correct place for such a discussion. Mr. Arrich agreed, noting that the CVFPP must be designed with enough flexibility to effectively coordinate with projects like the Feasibility Study. Staff will work to develop an appropriate response to this concern.
- A participant asked whether RMAWG members and other local stakeholders will be involved in the CVFPP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. Mr. Arrich confirmed that they would be.

Opening Remarks

Noel Lerner delivered an opening presentation that included background on CVFPP Scope, Phase 1 processes/work products and a walkthrough of expected process/products for Phases 2-4. The CVFPP EIR will be prepared concurrently with other work products and submitted to the California Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) along with the CVFPP for approval in 2012. Mr. Arrich added that despite the “phased” approach to CVFPP development, all work products will be iterative; if at the end of Phase 2 it appears that additional management actions are required, stakeholders and staff will have the latitude to consider these needs during subsequent phases..

Discussion:

- A participant asked what the 2012 CVFPP will look like (i.e., what will the final product be?). Mr. Arrich explained that it will be a series of “alternatives” structured into regional and system wide

solution sets. Before the 2012 plan is complete, DWR will have some idea of what the 2017 plan will look like; it will most likely include actions from ongoing studies throughout the Central Valley, including things like the Feasibility Study.

- A participant asked how new facilities can be added to the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC),. Mr. Arrich agreed that this is a significant issue, and noted that it will have to be addressed in the CVFPP. Merritt Rice and Mr. Lerner added that new facilities to the SPFC will have to meet a series of requirements to be incorporated. Existing Early Implementation Projects (EIP) are facing similar challenges; as more data becomes available, DWR will be able to provide a more complete answer.
- One participant noted that the iterative nature of the CVFPP required by SB 5 (Machado) in 2007 required DWR to update requirements for facilities of the SPFC as physical land use changes and advances in science occur.

Overview of Management Actions Development Process

Roger Putty delivered a presentation on the Phase 2 Management Actions development process and Phase 2 schedule. He noted that many of the specific actions for further development in Phase 2 were discussed by Work Group members in Phase 1. In addition to these actions, DWR and technical staff looked at reference documents to develop additional management actions. These actions will be the building blocks for solutions to region specific problems.

Discussion:

- A participant asked how the management actions will be used to create regional solution sets. Mr. Putty responded that a series of Management Action Workshops and Topic Work Groups (discussed in more detail below) will further refine the management actions. These actions will be returned to the Work Group for additional input and comment, and then formulated into a series of regional solution sets that will assign region-specific actions to the region they affect. The solution set development process is discussed in more detail below.

After initial discussion, Mr. Putty reviewed the Management Action Summary Table. As discussed, after Phase 1 a number of action items were developed to address specific concerns described in Phase 1 Regional and Topic Work Groups. These management actions are divided into 11 categories on a range of topics. After a review of the Table, Mr. Putty reviewed the sample Management Action Evaluation Form. For each of the 80+ actions in the 11 categories, an Evaluation Form consisting of a series of questions was filled out. The same questions are applied to each management action to create standardized evaluation criteria. Ms. Lott asked participants to review the Table and Evaluation Form and provide comments on the categories. She directed participants to submit any detailed written comments on the actions/categories to Joe Bartlett and Mr. Putty. A staff-developed Evaluation Form for each management action will be the focus of discussion during the Management Action Workshops.

Discussion:

- The concern was raised that the actions in some categories such as permitting and ecosystem restoration apply to everything covered in the CVFPP. Additionally, some actions in the permitting category appear to be more closely tied to ecosystem restoration than permitting specifically. Several participants noted that “permitting” should include everything from streamlining the permitting process to reducing regulation for new flood control projects. One participant noted that simply mapping out the entire permitting process or creating a single point of contact for permitting new flood projects should be included as actions in this category. Mr. Putty acknowledged that many Phase 1 participants stressed the need for this type of increased coordination on permitting issues, and responded that unlike some of the other categories like additional storage or floodplain management, permitting may not be region specific and apply more to a system wide solution set. Mr. Lerner added that the idea of a “one-stop-shop” for

permitting needs has merit, and should be further investigated as an action in its own right. This must be done carefully to avoid significant reorganization within agencies. Instead, developing key “permitting experts” that can answer any permitting questions may be more useful.

- A participant suggested that many of the things in the permitting category might fit better into the policy and regulation category.
- A participant noted that the CVFPP will have major land use implications. There seems to be a focus on surface storage in the management actions; there should also be actions to address groundwater recharge as an alternate storage option. He noted that several local groups are working to reduce the amount of water that flows back into streams to reduce pollution (primarily an NPDES issue).
- A participant commented that the management action category strategy presupposes solutions instead of thoroughly investigating the problem. For instance, putting all ecosystem management actions in the same “box” discounts the fact that ecosystem regulations apply to any and all flood control projects. The participant also noted that because the Management Action Workshops (discussed below) are organized around categories, only participants interested in one particular category or another will be able to provide input on those categories (i.e., only members of the environmental community will attend the ecosystem restoration workshop, creating one-sided input on these management actions). This item was flagged for additional discussion by staff.
- A participant noted that “flood system modification” should be reworded to include reference to constructing new facilities. Staff agreed to revisit the title.
- Several participants raised concerns about the flood liability issue, and the suggestion was made that this be included as its own category. They stressed the importance of defining what agency/jurisdiction is liable for flooding in different parts of the system as opposed to stating whether or not a particular action may increase liability for the state. This item was flagged for additional discussion; staff noted that it has been raised in many of the other RMAWGs as well.
- The concern was raised that the liability question on page 2 of the Evaluation Form could force DWR to screen out new additions to the SPFC since they could increase liability to the state. Mr. Putty responded that “screening” may be too strong of a word; the questions are designed to show how a particular action could affect the CVFPP.
- A participant suggested that the Evaluation Forms could include a list of related management actions. Mr. Putty responded that there is a question that speaks to “integration with other programs,” but it could be strengthened to specifically reference other actions.
- A concern was raised that the economic question in the Evaluation Form that attributes a “high, medium, or low” cost to each action is too subjective (different individuals may have a different understanding of what each of these categories means). Instead, it was suggested that a range of actual dollar amounts be attributed to potential actions. Staff responded that cost estimates have not been developed yet, but that this is the intention further into the CVFPP process. At this time, however, specific ranges are not available.
- A participant noted that an additional question could be added to the Evaluation Form that speaks to short vs. long term cost. For instance, for a relatively small short term investment, a system could be designed to fail at a low level, while the long term cost (including repairs, liability, etc) would be quite high.

Solution Set Development

Mr. Putty delivered a presentation and handouts on the regional and system wide solution set development process. In particular, he directed participants to review the “puzzle graphic” that lays out three sets for solution set development: management actions that apply directly to system wide solutions,

regional-specific actions, and actions that should be removed from consideration in the CVFPP. More information on the solution set development process and solution set “themes” is available in the PowerPoint presentation. After the presentation, Mr. Putty asked participants to discuss whether or not the proposed approach makes sense, and how it might be further clarified/improved.

Discussion:

- A participant asked if management actions within a region will be “prioritized” within each regional solution set. Mr. Putty responded that there will likely be some sort of prioritization exercise, but it has not been developed yet. Solution sets are intended to be more conceptual than project/site specific.
- One participant noted that in Phase 1, the issue of decision/prioritization criteria came up regarding regional conditions. He added that once any type of prioritization exercise begins, it will be very important to have clearly defined decision criteria from DWR. Mr. Putty noted that some of the evaluation tools/decision criteria will be developed in the Topic Work Groups and brought back to the RMAWGs for comment. The exact process for this comment process has not yet been defined.
- A participant asked what “initial investment” refers to in the solution set themes. Mr. Rice responded that initial investment speaks to the original cost/size of a particular project (e.g., an action could be to bring the entire SPFC up to its original design standard -- this would have a very high initial investment).
- Participants asked where economic development and the groundwater recharge issue would fit into the “themes”. Mr. Arrich noted that there may not be enough information available to answer this question yet, but that it would likely be under “initial investment.”
- A participant asked if the “themes” are the criteria used to begin narrowing down the list of management actions. Mr. Arrich responded that this is not the intention. Instead, the themes are intended to be the main things that a particular regional or system wide solution set should seek to address as a whole -- individual management actions would be used to satisfy one theme or another. Joe Bartlett noted that this work is really the focus of Phase 3.
- A participant noted that there are many levees that are not part of the SPFC or federal levee system, and asked how management actions/solution sets will apply to non-project levees. Mr. Rice noted that in addition to the CVFPP, as part of the larger Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program (CVFMP), a State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document and Flood Control Systems Status Report are being developed. These two companion documents to the CVFPP will outline how non-project levees affect the SPFC and vice versa. Management actions will be developed to address these issues as they arise.

MA Workshops

Mr. Putty directed participants to review the Management Action Workshop Attendees Guide. Each of the 11 management action categories will have its own corresponding workshop. The goal of the workshops is to build a comprehensive list of management actions to bring back to RMAWG meeting #2 for comment and review. Each management action for discussion during the workshop will have its own Evaluation Form for comment and discussion. These materials will be distributed to attendees and posted to the CVFMP website on July 6th. Participants should review these materials and bring comments to the workshop if possible, although written comments can be submitted as well. Given the iterative nature of the CVFPP process, the workshops are intended to be the primary, but not only, venue for developing management actions. Ms. Lott asked participants to sign up for workshops, and noted that at least one Work Group member should attend each workshop (either in person or via Webinar/conference call).

Process for responding to comments

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the document entitled "Procedure for Addressing Comments." This document reviews the specific process for reconciling conflicting comments on management actions. Questions/comments on Work Group logistics should be forwarded to facilitation support; all technical/content-related questions should be forwarded to Mr. Putty and Mr. Bartlett. If comments are a matter of factual discord, the most recent studies pertaining to the comment will be consulted. If the question/comment is a matter of state policy, it will be forwarded to the appropriate DWR management for reconciliation and decision.

Discussion:

- A participant raised the concern that comments made during Work Group meetings may not be appropriately captured or responded to, and asked that a process be developed to explain to members whether their comments from meetings will be used in the CVFPP. Staff agreed to develop such a process, noting that many comments/questions made during meetings (such as the liability issue discussed above) may not have immediate resolution. Staff can indicate whether a comment will be included or may require additional consideration.
- A participant reiterated the need for redlined documents to show where changes to the Report are made and whether Work Group comments were included.